



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Mailed: AUG 26 2004

BC  
Paper Number:

In re application of	:	
Herald Berger et al.	:	
Serial No. 10/021,373	:	DECISION ON
Filed: October 22, 2001	:	PETITION
For: DEVICE FOR MELTING DOWN METAL CONTAINING	:	
MATERIALS	:	

This is a decision on the PETITION TO WITHDRAW THE HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT, filed April 28, 2004. Petitioner asserts that their office did not receive the Office action of October 1, 2003 and a search of the file and the docket entries was conducted to locate the Office action but no Office action was found. The Petitioner also attached a docket record for the above-identified application to show that the Office action was never received.

**DECISION**

A review of the petitioner's evidence provided with the instant Petition and the application record indicates that the request does not have merit. The October 1, 2003 Office action was mailed to the address of:

Pitney, Hardin, Kipp & Szuch LLP  
711 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10017-4014.

However, it is clear from the application record that the attorney's correspondence address changed before the mailing of the Office action of October 1, 2003, as is evidenced by the address supplied in the Papers submitted on March 4, 2002. None of these Papers were directed to changing the correspondence address for the above-identified application.

As set forth in MPEP 711.03(c), "where an application becomes abandoned as a consequence of a change of correspondence address (the Office action being mailed to the old, uncorrected address and failing to reach the applicant in sufficient time to permit a timely reply) an adequate showing of "unavoidable" delay will require a showing that due care was taken to adhere to the requirement for prompt notification in each concerned application of the change of address (see MPEP § 601.03), and must include an adequate showing that a timely notification of the change of address was filed in the application concerned, and in a manner reasonably calculated to call attention to the fact that it was a notification of a change of address. The following do not constitute proper notification of a change in correspondence address:


- (A) the mere inclusion, in a paper filed in an application for another purpose, of an address differing from the previously provided correspondence address, without mention of the fact that an address change was being made;
- (B) the notification on a paper listing plural applications as being affected (except

10/021,373

as provided for under the Customer Number practice - see MPEP § 403); or  
(C) the lack of notification, or belated notification, to the U.S. Patent and  
Trademark Office of the change in correspondence address.”

In the instant case, the Petitioner failed to properly notify the USPTO of the change in  
correspondence address, which ultimately resulted in the non-receipt of the October 1, 2003  
Office action. While the Petitioner did submit a proper change of correspondence address on  
April 16, 2004, this was after the statutory date for response to the October 1, 2003 Office action.  
Accordingly, this Petition cannot be granted.

The Petition is hereby **DENIED.**



Jacqueline Stone, Director  
Technology Center 1700  
Chemical and Materials Engineering

Pitney Hardin LLP  
7 Times Square  
New York, NY 10036-7311